



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/865,371	55,371 05/25/2001		Earl Walter Emerick	ROC920010109US1	3728
46797	7590	09/05/2006		EXAMINER	
		N, INTELLECTU	LANEAU, RONALD		
DEPT 917, 1 3605 HIGH			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ROCHESTI	ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			3627	
				DATE MAILED: 09/05/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office A - 1' O	09/865,371	EMERICK ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Ronald Laneau	3627					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 Ju	ıne 2006.						
	action is non-final.						
,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	•						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-46 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachment(s)	_						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:						

Application/Control Number: 09/865,371 Page 2

Art Unit: 3627

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on 6/22/06 has been entered. Claims 1-46 remain pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bhat (US 5,668,995) in view of Cline et al (US 2002/0087897 A1).

Bhat discloses a method of operating a computerized system to provide computer recommendation information including the steps of generating an operation profile for a computer using machine information specific to the computer and obtained from the computer (see abs.), wherein the operation profile indicates at least a usage trend for the computer and generating a recommendation for at least one computer system solution which satisfies at least the projected requirements (see claim 19, paragraph d). Bhat further discloses the steps of generating the operation profile, receiving the machine information from the computer via a network connection (see figs. 2A, 2B; all information is received within the network). Bhat discloses a system that can collect the system's performance at intervals shorter than the first timed intervals as claimed (see fig. 1); a system wherein the plurality of system options are provided by a plurality of third party solution providers (col. 5, lines 60-65), further include the steps of configuring the at least one computer system solution to indicate system specifications

Application/Control Number: 09/865,371

Art Unit: 3627

and a price (col. 6, lines 32-38). Jon does not disclose a computer system solution based on the usage trend as claimed but Cline discloses determining projected requirements for at least one computer system solution based on the usage trend for the computer and obtained from the computer (page 3, [0038] – [0039]); further discloses future possible configurations for a computer system wherein a user of the system is allowed to make modifications to the configuration whether it's the specifications or price (page 3, [0034]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the system solution based on the usage trend as taught by Cline into the system of Bhat because it would provide such comprehensive control over operational states of a computer system.

As per claims 3-4, 6-7, 13, 19, 28-29 and 33, the system as taught by Bath is well capable of allowing a user to modify the recommendation base on the usage patterns of the network and also generating recommendation comprising processing system requirements specifications reflecting a desire d future use of the computer (see fig. 1).

As per claims 9, 11-12, 14, 20-22, 33, 35-36, 40, 42, 44 and 45, Bhat discloses configuring the at least one computer solution to indicate specifications and price; receiving a purchase order for configured system; receiving a configuration selection from the user to modify the starting configuration; determining whether the configuration selection is valid; and if so, producing a configured system viewable by the user (col. 1 lines 52 to col. 2, line 10).

Application/Control Number: 09/865,371

Art Unit: 3627

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues that the present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion of a prima facie case of obviousness. In response to Applicant's arguments, Bhat would normally allow a user to search for information specific about a computer and obtained such information from the computer itself. This kind of information must be specific to said computer since one is trying to determine the amount of usage and if any services are needed. Claims 1-46 remain rejected.

Conclusion

5. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 09/865,371 Page 5

Art Unit: 3627

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Ronald Laneau whose telephone number is (571) 272-6784. The

examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 8:30am - 6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on (571) 272-6771. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ronald Laneau

Ronald Donesu

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3627

8/23/06

rl